

Thereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FIRST).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WE CAN DO BETTER

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I speak from the floor of the Senate as a Democrat but really to all of my colleagues, and to the President, as well.

I think that President Clinton's State of the Union Address was, indeed, an important step forward for our country in some of the initiatives that he outlined. When the President talked about education and talked about child care and talked about health care, I think what he said resonated with people throughout the country. I think it has a lot to do with the fact that people are less interested in denunciation and more interested in enunciation. They really want to know what it is we stand for and whether or not we are thinking seriously, all of us, even if we have disagreement on some of these issues, about where our country needs to be.

In that sense, what the President talked about was an important step forward. First, a response to what some of my colleagues had to say on the floor of the Senate, and then a response to some of the President's initiatives and to Democrats. On the Republican side, I think the argument that has been made, that I have heard colleagues make on the floor of Senate—and I summarize what any number of different Republican colleagues have said—in many ways amounts to the argument that when it comes to the most pressing issues of people's lives, there is nothing the Government really can or should do. This is not an appropriate role for the Government to play—to assure that there is affordable child care for working families, to assure that there is affordable health care, to invest in more teachers in our schools, reducing class size, and so forth. Quite frankly, that argument is a great argument for people who own their own large corporations or are wealthy, but it doesn't work for most of the people in the country. Most of the people in Minnesota and most of the people in the country are very focused, as I have said on the floor of Senate, as to how they can earn a decent living and how they can raise their children successfully.

The President's proposals speak to that, at least part of the way. But what concerns me about what the President said, and I give credit where credit is due, what concerns me about the way in which Democrats are speaking about these proposals, is I think that we can do much better. This is our oppor-

tunity. The business cycle is up. We all talk about economic performance. This is the time where we can really make some of these critical investments.

Mr. President, what I worry about is that we give the speeches, there is a lot of hype. We talk about the importance of early childhood development, we talk about the importance of education, we talk about health care, but we do not invest enough resources to put this on a scale where it is really going to make a significant difference. If we don't do that, if we have such a downsized politics and policy that we only reach a tiny fraction of those people that we are talking about, those children, those working families, then I think it invites mutiny because it becomes just symbolic politics.

Let me give a few examples. Mr. President, as far as I can determine when we talk about child care, without going into all the statistics, and we think about families with incomes of \$35,000 a year and under, we will probably reach, with the amount of resources the President has talked about investing in early childhood development, about 2 out of 10 children who could benefit—2 out of 10 children. If it is so compelling, and if the evidence is irreducible and irrefutable that we have to get it right for these children by age 3 otherwise many of them will never do well in school and will never be prepared for life, then why are we only investing in 2 out of 10 children?

After-school program. Again, an important initiative, but as I look at the number of children who could benefit from this, and I think about my travel in some of our inner-city communities and rural communities, much less the suburbs, we will be reaching, with the President's proposal, about 1 out of 10 young people or children that are eligible. If it is important to have good positive things going on for young people in our communities after school, why is it only important to reach 1 out of 10 young people or children that would be eligible?

Now I know what I am saying is counterintuitive because in a way I'm in the tiny minority on this, but I think we can do much better. I will introduce child care legislation and I will talk about 5 out of 10 children, that we can at least reach half the children that really deserve to have nurturing child care, that deserve to have the highest quality child care. Why are we only talking about affordable child care that is only affordable for about 20 percent of the families that need the assistance? Why are we not making sure that every child in the United States of America, when he or she goes to kindergarten, knows how to spell her name, knows the alphabet, knows colors, shapes and sizes? Why can't we make sure that we make the investment in the public sector, private sector and volunteers and communities, that every single child comes to kindergarten, ready to learn? The President's proposal is a step in the right di-

rection but we can do much better. We can do much better.

A second example, health care. Mr. President, I'm all for expanding Medicare, but the current proposal that the President has outlined makes it impossible for most citizens between the ages of 55 and 65 to be able to afford the premium. Most won't benefit. Second of all, I don't know why—I guess I speak more to Democrats, my party—why have we abandoned the idea of comprehensive health care reform, universal health care coverage? Why are we not talking about a strategy for our country whereby the next century, next millennium, each and every citizen will be able to benefit from dignified, humane, affordable health care? Why, Democrats, have we backed away from this?

I'm going to introduce legislation that will have a national progressive framework, a defined package of benefits. Remember, colleagues, remember what we talked about a few short years ago, that every citizen should have health care at least as good as what Senators and Representatives get? I believe that. I think all of us should believe that. It will also make sure that States agree that it will be affordable and it will also have strong consumer protection, but then it leaves it up to States as to how to get there. There will be Federal grants for each and every State that agrees to reach, within the next 5 years, universal coverage. Different states can do it different ways. We can decentralize it. But we ought not to give up on the goal of humane, affordable, dignified health care for each and every citizen in our country. The American people believe in that. It might be that the insurance industry, which has so much clout here, doesn't believe in it, but the majority of people in our country do, and Democrats and Republicans, we ought to be on their side. We ought to be on their side.

The third example, Mr. President, which is near and dear to my heart, call it counterintuitive politics because we don't talk about it very much but I think we should. I have traveled all across the country. I have had a chance to meet with a lot of people in poor communities. I want to raise the minimum wage. I think we should do that. It is a matter of elementary simple justice. I am proud to join Senator KENNEDY in this fight. We will raise the minimum wage 50 cents a year for the next 3 years and then index it. If people work full time 52 weeks a year 40 hours a week they ought not to be poor in America. If you had health care and child care, you really would be making a difference in terms of family income.

Mr. President, I also visited communities, be they rural or urban, where there are no jobs, even with the economy being where it is, even with official unemployment at record low levels. I go to inner-city Baltimore or inner-city Chicago or Minneapolis, I can go to Appalachia, rural Appalachia, I can go to rural Minnesota, and

in all too many cases the jobs are not there, or the jobs at decent wages are not there. Why don't we make a commitment to making sure that people find employment? That is dignity.

We have communities where there are compelling needs—there is elder care, there is child care, there is housing rehab, there is community crime prevention, there is teacher's assistance, there is environmental cleanup, all sorts of work to be done and people who can't find any jobs. I will introduce a bill that will provide people—we have now a 5 million job gap between people that want to work and jobs vacant—provide people with a transition whereby they have a job for a year at a decent wage with these benefits, and then can transition to private sector. We need to get more private capital in these communities. But when you have people in our rural areas, our ghettos and our barrios who have worked and worked on community-building jobs and have the dignity and build up some of the skills, then private sector gets more interested in these communities. But right now in a lot of communities in our country, people are crying out, where are the jobs?

Mr. President, we can do much better. We have to make these investments. I am saying to my colleagues today on the floor of the Senate that as we go into the next century there are some contradictions we cannot live with. There are some contradictions in this city, Washington, DC, right here in this city, and all across the country. We have to make sure that we are investing in communities. We have to make sure we are investing in children. We have to make sure we are investing in education, and not just in education for some children, not just affordable child care for some children, not just health care for some citizens. If we are going to argue that these are priorities, then we have to back the rhetoric with the resources. We have to make the investment.

Mr. President, I worry that at the very time where we have the best chance to make this investment—at a time of real optimism, at a time when I think people in the country feel good and know that we can do better, that justice, fairness, opportunity, building communities and building leadership are things that we can do—we are going to miss the opportunity by making speeches but not following up the speeches, by not really meaning what we say, and not really making the investment.

President Clinton, thank you for pinpointing some of these initiatives. Republican colleagues, maybe in areas like child care we can come together. I hope we can. But for the President and all my colleagues, we can't outline problems and say we are committed to making a huge difference and then not make the investment that is anywhere near the scale of what needs to be done to make a difference. We can do much better than what the President out-

lined in his address for children, we can do much better for education, we can do much better for health care, and we can do much better when it comes to tackling problems with race, gender, poverty, and children in America.

I appreciate what the President has outlined as a first step, but we ought to be doing much better here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. We ought to be doing much better. This is our chance to make an enormous difference.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business until 2:45 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER RAY C. SIMMONS, U.S. NAVY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding Naval officer, Commander Ray C. Simmons, upon his retirement from the Navy after more than twenty years of commissioned service. Throughout his career, Commander Simmons has served with distinction, and it is my privilege to recognize his many accomplishments and to commend him for the superb service he has provided the Navy and the nation.

Commander Simmons entered the United States Naval Academy from the State of New Hampshire in 1973 and was commissioned as an Ensign upon graduation in 1977. Since then, Commander Simmons has spent his career patrolling the world's oceans as a Naval Flight Officer and oceanographer. Following flight training, he began his service in Patrol Squadron Four in Barbers Point, Hawaii, making three deployments to the western Pacific, Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf, including operations in support of the 1979-80 Iranian hostage crisis. In 1990, he joined the staffs of the United States Sixth Fleet and NATO Strike Force South, embarked in USS *Belknap*, homeported in Gaeta, Italy. During the Persian Gulf War, Commander Simmons, as Fleet oceanographer, served as a member of the TLAM cruise missile targeting team, planning strikes on Iraq from the eastern Mediterranean Sea. He also served as Flag Lieutenant and personal aide to the Sixth Fleet Commander.

When not at sea, Commander Simmons has likewise served with distinction on the staffs of Patrol Wing Two and the Chief of Naval Operations, in the Naval Western Oceanography Center and as Aide and acting Deputy Executive Assistant to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He served with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as the first Department of Defense liaison officer for joint NASA-Defense earth science applications programs. In 1995, he commanded the United States Naval Ice Center, with additional responsibility as Director of the joint Coast Guard, Navy and National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration United States National Ice Center, and served as the lead Department of Defense lead technical advisor to the Russia-United States Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission Environmental Working Group. Among Commander Simmons's many awards and decorations are the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, four Meritorious Service Medals, two Navy Expeditionary Medals and the Southwest Asia Service Medal. He is both a qualified Naval Flight Officer and Naval oceanographer.

During his more than twenty year career, Commander Simmons has served the United States Navy and the nation with excellence and distinction. He has been an integral member of, and contributed greatly to, the best-trained, best-equipped and best-prepared naval force in the history of the world. Commander Simmons's unflappable leadership, integrity, and limitless energy have had a profound and positive impact on the United States Navy and the nation.

Commander Simmons will retire from the United States Navy on March 1, 1998, after twenty years and nine months of dedicated commissioned service. On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I wish Commander Simmons fair winds and following seas. Congratulations on completion of an outstanding and successful career.

#### RETIREMENT OF CAPTAIN JOHN LYNCH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a man a number of us, especially those who are members of the Armed Services Committee, have come to know over the past several years, Captain John Lynch who retired from the United States Navy during the Christmas Recess.

There are few careers more demanding or rewarding than those in our armed forces, and in, 1972, John Lynch joined the Navy. Despite Richard Nixon's overwhelming re-election to the Presidency, this was a tension charged era in our Nation, we were in the waning days of our involvement in Vietnam and most young people were seeking ways to avoid military service. Few people were actually entering the